

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/19/2014 12:27 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Enterprises Corporation at CSUSB (U411C140073)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	34
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	29
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 9: 84.411C

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: University Enterprises Corporation at CSUSB (U411C140073)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

This 4 year project is requesting \$2,996,961 to serve 4,000 PreK–6th grade students, 75 teachers and 7 principals in two school districts.

The applicant addresses all the factors, while demonstrating a clear understanding of the criterion requirements, with a strong alignment between what is proposed, how it will be carried out and the subsequent impact. See the comments for each criterion for more details.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

The project directly addresses Absolute Priority 4(a) through the creation of a professional development (PD) model and student interventions that result in increasing the number and proportion of ELs that successfully complete challenging courses in core academic subjects—not only in mathematics, but in other subjects through structured writing (e19).

The project clearly explains the project's unique approach to improving EL outcomes by keeping a strong disciplinary focus on mathematics, combining four structured inquiry-focused interventions targeting students, teachers, and school leaders (e19). Given the need to intervene early for student success, another novel aspect of TEEM will be the creation of a Professional Development pipeline for preschool educators who rarely receive opportunities for math-focused PD (e30).

The project is designed to advance current practices with interventions built upon existing research-based practices with

adaptations that will make it an exemplar for new practice (e20). For example, interactive notebooks used successfully in many science classrooms will be adapted to math classes. The combination of interactive notebooks with the lesson study model for PD will be a unique and powerful way for teachers to develop effective formative assessment practices (e21).

Weaknesses:

The project states it will support teachers in the shifts using the Japanese lesson study model (e21), but it does not fully explain how this model will be utilized with teachers.

Reader's Score: 34

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly describes how the use of mutually supportive inquiry-based interventions will help the project to accomplish its four key goals (e24).

Drawing upon its successful experience with previous complex partner-driven projects, the applicant has identified several anticipated potential risks to project success and have developed strategies to mitigate these identified risks (e29). For example, principals' lack of time for PD will be addressed by building project activities into district principals' existing schedules and meetings that are part of the principals' everyday work.

In this reviewer's opinion, the applicant provides a project Logic Model that succinctly links Inputs and Outputs (activities) with outcomes for teachers, principals, students and long term systemic outcomes (e25).

The applicant discusses how it obtained input from various stakeholders which has informed the design of this project. For example, it surveyed teachers for input in the project design with high positive responses (92-94% as very interested) (e28).

Also, the applicant has included a Project Design Summary (e28) specifically describing the professional development to include: what is to be accomplished (e.g., whole numbers and algebraic thinking, place value); when it will be accomplished (i.e., specific dates or number of hours); and who will be involved (e.g., 75 P-K - 6th grade teachers with seven principals over all four years).

Weaknesses:

The applicant lacks a clear description or plan for how the pre-K teachers will be linked into the activities of the project. It does not provide details for how the preschool teacher will be recruited into the project or how they will be supported throughout the entire project.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

The applicant provides an extensive, detailed table which summarizes and aligns each of the key outcomes and management objectives with the responsible person's timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities over the four years of the project. The applicant also provided both the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis and annual performance targets (e31).

The partners have worked together before with success and have committed the resources necessary to ensure fulfillment of the project's goals (e33). The partner's commitments are demonstrated with letters of support detailing their in-kind commitments and planned services.

The partners have put procedures in place to ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the project. For example, the Leadership Team will include teacher liaisons representing each participating site and will meet each month to provide feedback to the project management team. The Steering Committee will include leaders from each of the partner LEAs, as well as a parent representative, and will meet on a quarterly basis to provide regular feedback between partners (e34).

The project director has the content expertise and management process experience, as well as knowledge of the participants and communities to be served (e34).

Weaknesses:

The project states it will recruit Teacher Liaisons from each LEA school site, but it does not describe how they will be recruited or the qualifications and expertise they will need to serve in this role. It is unclear if this position is intended as a volunteer position or whether it will be compensated in some manner.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

N/A. Scored by another peer reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A. Scored by another peer reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/19/2014 12:27 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/21/2014 08:50 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Enterprises Corporation at CSUSB (U411C140073)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	28
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	68

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 9: 84.411C

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: University Enterprises Corporation at CSUSB (U411C140073)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

This application meets the absolute priority through strategies to increase teacher and principal capacity to support EL student mastery of mathematics. The proposal seeks to connect a focused program in math instruction with overall EL student success, as well as increased capacity of teachers to utilize cycles of inquiry in their classrooms.

This approach is novel, with the utilization of interactive student notebooks for mathematics, and intensive professional development for teachers in order for EL students to master the new CCSS in mathematics.

The project, if successful, would assist other districts in focusing their efforts in mathematics instruction as a means of improving outcomes for EL learners.

Weaknesses:

This proposal does not make a persuasive or concrete connection between mastery of mathematics and overall achievement in other subject areas. The emphasis on mathematics will still require significant literacy support in order for

it to be successful, and this is not addressed in the application.

Reader's Score: 28

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

The project design is simple, focusing on four core components to reach the goal of utilizing mathematics as a means to achieve improved outcomes for EL students. Each of the four components complement each other, and there is sufficient detail describing each component. The design is based on prior research and field work on a similar project, where they had success in improving outcomes for students. The benchmarks are aligned to the goals.

There is substantial professional development for teachers and administrators, which will create a strong foundation for the work.

The logic model provides some detail about the project.

The format of the Project Design Summary is not conducive to getting a full four year picture of the project. It appears that different math concepts will be taught each summer, with teachers having the entire program of learning completed by year four.

The applicant has a detailed list of potential risks and strategies for mitigating the risks.

Weaknesses:

The addition of pre-K teachers seems an afterthought, and is not tied into the rest of the narrative in a clear way. They do not appear in the project design summary or in the narrative. Mathematics professional development for pre-K teachers will be very different than for K-5.

There is no mention of engaging parents or other stakeholders in this project.

In this reviewer's opinion, the logic model does not have measurable outcomes listed.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

The identified staff members for the project are qualified and have experience with similar projects. The project appropriately invests in hiring a professional development team with expertise in EL instruction and mathematics to lead the training for teachers. The management plan on pp. 16-18 provide clarity on the actions and milestones for each objective, as well as benchmarks and metrics. There are milestones for each annual performance target, and partners have experience. Letters of support are attached. Plan for continuous improvement is included and includes detailed action steps.

Weaknesses:

There does not appear to be a full time staff member dedicated exclusively to this project. There are several .5 FTEs listed as project manager, project director, and financial manager. None of the members of this team have a background in teaching EL, or mathematics to EL students.

The success of the implementation will rest on the ability of this team to meet with 75 teachers that will be learning and teaching in new ways, and they will need feedback and support throughout the four years.

The management plan lists 90 comparison teachers and 90 treatment teachers, as well as teacher liaisons. The utilization of comparison teachers or teacher liaisons was not mentioned in the narrative on the project design, and their roles are not explained in the proposal.

There is a plan to have a parent on the steering committee, but no effort is made to help parents understand how to support math learning at home, or how to engage with the math notebooks, or other processes being put in place in the project.

There is a letter of support from a non-profit that supports math instruction for Latino students, but their role is never explained in the grant narrative.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

N/A Reviewed by a different peer reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A Reviewed by a different peer reviewer.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/21/2014 08:50 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/20/2014 08:18 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Enterprises Corporation at CSUSB (U411C140073)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	34
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	29
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	0
Total	100	81

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 9: 84.411C

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: University Enterprises Corporation at CSUSB (U411C140073)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

N/A

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

1.) The proposed project addresses Absolute Priority 4(a). The applicant proposes to increase the number and proportion ELs successfully completing challenging courses in core academic subjects by implementing structured inquiry-based approaches to learning, teaching and school leadership. The proposed result is collective efficacy in schools and providing ELs with access to challenging math content from pre-K through grade 6. The project will directly affect at least 4,000 students, 75 teachers and 7 principals. (pp. 1-8, A-19)

2.) The applicant's Teaching English Learners Early Mathematics (TEEM) approach proposes to build on a history of close collaboration among partners and stakeholders to develop, implement and evaluate a replicable model for improving the academic achievement of ELs students. The applicant stated that Mathematics interventions are timely in light of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSS-M). TEEM will support teachers in the shift to using the new Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) tests to assess student proficiency with respect to the CCSS-M, which the applicant stated was a challenge for ELs because of the higher language demands of the tests. TEEM will help ELs develop metacognitive and non-cognitive skills through the use of interactive inquiry notebooks for math and through the creation of a professional development (PD) model and student interventions. The inclusion of the professional development pipeline is a solid strength of the proposal. (pp. 3-5)

3.) The applicant stated that TEEM interventions are built upon existing research and promising practice with adaptations that will make it an exemplar for new practice. The interactive notebooks proposed will be measured for impact in accelerating EL achievement not only in math but in language learning. Lesson study will also be used; teachers will share learning goals by researching relevant curriculum and pedagogy, and then plan, observe, and refine a “research lesson” addressing the goals. TEEM will also support principals as “lead learners” at schools, developing their capacity as instructional leaders in the transition to CCSS. (p. 5)

Weaknesses:

3.) The link between mathematics and EL learning is insufficiently demonstrated. The number of schools to be selected for treatment or comparison in the evaluation component is not identified.

Reader's Score: 34

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

1.) In this reviewer’s opinion, the proposal contains a fully developed logic model with Inputs and Activities clearly aligned to the proposed project Outcomes. The proposal also contains a detailed chart of the Project Design Summary. The components of the program complement each other. The benchmarks for success are well aligned with the project goals. Given the detailed plan proposed, the applicant successfully demonstrated a sound plan to achieve their proposed goals. The goals of the four-year development project include: to improve the academic achievement of ELs; to improve teacher knowledge and beliefs for teaching mathematics to ELs; to improve the teaching of math to ELs; and to develop principals as instructional leaders in mathematics. (Abstract, pp. 8-14, 24-25, D-2)

2.) The application includes potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks. The proposal included a Potential Risk and Mitigation chart. One risk included was the difficulty to change teacher beliefs regarding EL students. The mitigation proposed was to explicitly address teacher beliefs during Lesson Study activities. (p. 14)

Weaknesses:

1.) The preschool teacher component of the proposal lacked clarity. (pp. 8-12)

Reader's Score: 29

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

1.) The applicant clearly summarized, in table form, key outcomes and management objectives as well as the timelines and milestones for project activity completion and the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis and included annual performance targets. For example, the annual performance target to meet the objective of developing principals as instructional leaders in mathematics is that principals will participate in at least 80% of activities and demonstrate growth as measured by the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale. (pp. 15-18)

2.) The key project partners listed are: California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB), the Riverside County Office of Education (RCOE), two LEA partners, Romoland and Nuview Union School Districts (RSD and NUSD), and Romoland Head Start and State Preschool program. The organizations were also partners in the three-year ED MSP, Project DELTA. The partners will maintain a role in TEEM management through participation in the project Steering Committee. Detailed letters of commitment are included in Appendix G. The private sector organizations including the Noyce, Packard, and Heisting-Simons foundations. This well developed project was designed using three years of student achievement data to investigate project impact. (Abstract, pp. 8, 18-19, C-3, Appendix G)

3.) The TEEM management structure was well designed to ensure effective operation and maintain communication and feedback among partners. The leadership team will include teacher liaisons representing each participating site who will meet each month to provide feedback to the project management team. The steering committee will meet on a quarterly basis to discuss project impact and explore options for continuous improvement of the project. (pp. 14, 19)

4.) The proposed project director, [REDACTED] (.44 FTE) has extensive experience in managing projects of similar size and scope. She was the PI of Project DELTA, a three-year project providing mathematics PD to 100 teachers in 6 districts with \$3M in ED MSP funding.

The Professional Development (PD) Team will deliver and design the Summer PD and facilitate Lesson Study. The composition and responsibilities of the leadership structure to guide project implementation was included in chart form. (pp. 15, 19, Appendix F-Resumes of Key Personnel)

Weaknesses:

3.) Parental support for math learning is not demonstrated in the proposal.

Reader's Score: 18

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

N/A. Scored by another peer reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A. Scored by another peer reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/20/2014 08:18 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/16/2014 04:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Enterprises Corporation at CSUSB (U411C140073)

Reader #4: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	14
Total	100	14

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 9: 84.411C

Reader #4: *****

Applicant: University Enterprises Corporation at CSUSB (U411C140073)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

n/a

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

N/A. Scored by another peer reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A. Scored by another peer reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

N/A. Scored by another peer reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A. Scored by another peer reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project 's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director 's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

N/A. Scored by another peer reviewer.

Weaknesses:

N/A. Scored by another peer reviewer.

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

- This section is well organized and provides sufficient details to rate the quality of the project evaluation.
- The key questions are clear and directly linked to the goals and specified outcomes of the project (pp. 9, 16-20).
- The use of a quasi-experimental design is appropriate to evaluate the program given practical limitations on random assignment. The authors propose to use HLM and provide sufficient details about their plan to select a comparable comparison group of teachers and students who were not exposed to the program. A noted strength is that they are including both teachers and students in the comparison group, which will allow for an investigation of teacher characteristics that produce differential student outcomes. Multi-source and multi-measure assessments are appropriate and specified adequately. The sample size is sufficient for the MDES specified.
- This proposal includes clear key components and outcomes along with measurable and clearly specified thresholds for acceptable implementation. The tables on p. 24 and the Contrast Table are helpful to organize the methods, analyses, and targets/benchmarks by each question.
- A noted strength is that this school team has participated in prior program evaluations (p. 8). The external evaluator chosen for this proposal appears to have expertise in program evaluations of this nature. This project has clear support from key stakeholders.

Weaknesses:

- Although the HLM model includes students nested within classrooms, it does not account for classrooms nested within schools in the two districts, nor does it specify the number of schools to be selected for participation or comparison.

Reader's Score: 14

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/16/2014 04:25 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/19/2014 02:05 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: University Enterprises Corporation at CSUSB (U411C140073)

Reader #5: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	0
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	35	0
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	0
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	15	14
Total	100	14

Technical Review Form

Panel #9 - 2014 Development Full Panels - 9: 84.411C

Reader #5: *****

Applicant: University Enterprises Corporation at CSUSB (U411C140073)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement (Optional)

General:

NA scored by another reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. In determining the significance of the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project addresses the absolute priority the applicant is seeking to meet.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project would implement a novel approach as compared with what has been previously attempted nationally.

(3) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of theory, knowledge, and practices in the field of study.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to explain how the applicant's proposed project addresses the absolute priority and the subpart that it seeks to meet. Additionally, the Secretary asks that applicants explain how the proposed project is unique. Applicants should explain how their proposed projects fit into existing theory, knowledge, or practice, and how their proposed projects will serve as exemplars for new practices in the field.

Strengths:

NA Scored by another peer reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA Scored by another peer reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. In determining the quality of the proposed project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and coherence of the project goals, including the extent to which the proposed project articulates an explicit plan or actions to achieve its goals (e.g., a fully developed logic model of the proposed project).

(2) The clarity, completeness, and coherence of the project goals, and whether the application includes a description of project activities that constitute a complete plan for achieving those goals, including the identification of potential risks to project success and strategies to mitigate those risks.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address what activities the applicant will undertake in its proposed project, and how the applicant will ensure its project implementation is successful in achieving the project goals.

Strengths:

NA Scored by another peer reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA Scored by another peer reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the management plan articulates key responsibilities and well-defined objectives, including the timelines and milestones for completion of major project activities, the metrics that will be used to assess progress on an ongoing basis, and annual performance targets the applicant will use to monitor whether the project is achieving its goals.

(2) The extent of the demonstrated commitment of any key partners or evidence of broad support from stakeholders whose participation is critical to the project's long-term success.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

(4) The extent to which the project director has experience managing projects of similar size and scope as the proposed project.

Note: In responding to this criterion, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how the project team will evaluate the success or challenges of the project and use that feedback to make improvements to the project, and the role of key partners and their impact on the long-term success of the project, and how the project director's prior experiences have prepared them for implementing the proposed project of this size and scope successfully.

Strengths:

NA Scored by another peer reviewer

Weaknesses:

NA Scored by another peer reviewer

Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

In determining the quality of the project evaluation to be conducted, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The clarity and importance of the key questions to be addressed by the project evaluation, and the appropriateness of the methods for how each question will be addressed.

(2) The extent to which the evaluation plan includes a clear and credible analysis plan, including a proposed sample size and minimum detectable effect size that aligns with the expected project impact, and an analytic approach for addressing the research questions.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key components and outcomes of the project, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Note: In responding to this criterion, applicants should describe the key evaluation questions and address how the proposed evaluation methodologies will allow the project to answer those questions. The Secretary encourages applicants to include questions about the effectiveness of the proposed project with the specific student populations being served with grant funds. Further, the Secretary encourages applicants to identify what implementation and performance data the evaluation will generate and how the evaluation will provide data during the grant period to help indicate whether the project is on track to meet its goals. Finally, applicants should also address whether sufficient resources, which may include the qualifications of the independent evaluator, are included in the project budget to carry out the evaluation effectively.

Strengths:

The proposal authors identify an intervention, titled "TEEM", designed to improve the number and proportion of preK-6th grade English Language learners who complete challenging courses in core academic subjects by creating interventions designed to support communities of inquiry among students, teachers and school leaders.

They identify the lack of math skills as a key mechanism for failure and later drop out for EL students (p. 2). Because of this, they have configured a comprehensive math intervention that develops metacognitive and non-cognitive skills through the use of math notebooks. Teachers will also engage in lesson study with fellow teachers, where they share learning goals, discern student needs and evaluate success (p. 7). The graph on p. 7 identifies the components of the intervention. To further bolster the capacity of each school to provide such intensive math learning, principals will also be trained as instructional leaders in math (p. 7). The intervention is strategically configured to build school level resources in math at all levels. All components of the intervention are clearly described, grounded in theory and utilizes research based components (Lesson Study, Instructional leaders) that provide a clear and measurable framework for evaluation.

The alignment between goals, questions and measures is clearly identified in the goal table on p. 9; the listed questions on pp. 20-21 and Table 1 on p. 24 provides quantitative benchmarks aligned with each outcome. These all provide excellent clarity about the connection between the intervention and measures. The tables on pp. 16-18 link actions to milestones to performance targets, creating a clear organization of implementation. The proposed fidelity of implementation plan is adequate and includes multiple different data sources, clearly linked to their analytical plan (Appendix J).

The authors identify a quasi-experimental matched comparison group design (p. 20). They propose HLM analysis, and describe in detail the nested configuration of the data (pp. 2, 24). They have designed the HLM analysis to address the variation within and across classrooms (p. 20) and explain why this is needed for their data. Authors outline how they will test for baseline equivalence between intervention and comparison groups. They identify the variables they will use to proportionately match groups. The inclusion of disability in their list of matching variables is well considered. They match teachers by grade level and years of experience, and support their decisions with research. Authors provide a clear and appropriate power analysis adequate for their evaluation (pp. 21-22). In Appendix J, they outline their plan to ensure internal and external validity. The inclusion of notebooks in the evaluation is innovative, and they have developed a useful rubric to implement this (Appendix J).

The proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively through COREducational, which has extensive evaluation experience.

Weaknesses:

The authors claim that their approaches will develop collective efficacy in schools (p. 1), but the data measures listed on p. 23 do not indicate a measure for school level collective efficacy.

While the tables on pp. 16-18 link actions to milestones to performance targets, it would be helpful to have some discussion of the justification for performance targets.

Since this is designed as a whole school intervention, it would be best to calculate variance across schools, but they are only able to include 7 schools, likely due to resources.

The classroom observations will only be completed two times in the baseline year and one time after this. Classroom activities will likely vary greatly. This is not a robust measure of classroom activities.

Reader's Score: **14**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 09/19/2014 02:05 PM